

of, say, 20 Middle East leaders, all of us standing together with you, our American friends and others and declaring the end of the war, the end of the conflict, thereby carrying the message to our forefathers and to our grandchildren that we are again, all of us, the sons and daughters of Abraham, living in a tent of peace. We shall tell them together, as partners, we are going to build a new Middle East, a modern economy, that we are going to raise the standard of living, not the standard of violence, that we are going to introduce light and hope to our peoples and their destinies.

Remember the peace rally at Tel Aviv just weeks ago, where we had Yitzhak Rabin die. The singer, not the song was killed. Though Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin has died, the dream lives on. For those who believe in a lasting peace for the Middle East and peace across this world, the people of Israel, the people of the United States and the people who believe in Shimon Peres, that he, in fact, is the one who can carry forward in Israel and to work with world leaders like our President and this Congress, we say God bless him on this mission.

THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin tonight by adding my voice to those who praised the colleague who spoke here a few minutes ago, Mr. MFUME. This institution will be impoverished by his departure, but I am certain that his country will be enriched by his continuing service at the NAACP, a different kind of service, the same ideals he has served us. Please let my voice be added to the record to those who say we will miss him.

Mr. Speaker, as the country watches our continuing debate about the balanced budget, I wanted to say a few words tonight about why a balanced budget is so important beyond Washington bookkeeping or Federal financial statistics. We spent most of our time the last couple of weeks talking about how best to balance the budget. I would firmly stand with those who believe that we can do so without forcing a part B premium on our senior citizens Medicare or by taking reading teachers out of our public school and private school classrooms or without undercutting our ability to protect and enforce our environmental laws. Tonight I would like to talk about why it is so important to balance the budget in terms of the workaday life and family budgets of people all across our country.

I represent an awful lot of people who are struggling an awful lot in 1995, people who are unemployed, people who are barely employed, who are struggling at or just above the minimum wage to try to pay their bills with very little help from the government that assembles here. People who are woefully underemployed, who are making

70 or 80 percent of what their family budgets require. People who are employed but who feel that their employment is hanging by a very thin thread, that they may be the next victim of a corporate downsizing or a massive lay-off. People who are retired, who thought that they were going to be able to get by on whatever they had in the bank when they retired, plus their Social Security and, if they had a pension, plus their pension, who have found that those assumptions really do not work for them anymore and they are still in real trouble.

There are people who have never been employed who went to college, went to school, got their job training, got their education and cannot find that first job that puts them on the path to a successful career. How does a balanced budget affect each one of these people?

I would suggest that it affects us, Mr. Speaker, in four ways: First, every dollar that the Federal Government borrows to run its operation from the savings pool of this country is \$1 less that an employer, an entrepreneur, a business person has to start a new product, expand his or her business, and hire more people. Every dollar Uncle Sam borrows to meet the payroll is a dollar that cannot go to generating new payroll in companies and employers across this country. It is that simple.

Second, every time we pile up another dollar of debt, we have to spend more money to service that debt, just like if, Mr. Speaker, we raised the amount we owe on our credit cards in our family budget, the amount we have to pay toward that credit card each month continues to rise and rise and rise. This year it is in excess of \$200 billion, almost \$300 billion by some accountings, just interest on the national debt. What else could we buy with that money if we did not have this huge debt?

We could fully fund Head Start so that every child in this country who is eligible would be in a proper child care program. We would not have to worry about cutting back on Pell grants or student loans because there would be ample money for that. We could give a significant income tax reduction to everyone across the country with that money or perhaps, most importantly, we could start paying down the national debt that has been accumulated over here for such a long time.

Every time we send a dollar to pay, or a bond for this borrowed money, it is a dollar we are not spending on education or the environment or our military or health care or veterans programs or something for children. It is a mistake.

Third, the Federal deficit as it grows, continues to rise and put pressure up on interest rates. That means that every time someone buys a car or takes out a mortgage or makes a purchase on their credit card, it costs them more than it otherwise would. As the supply of money stays the same but the demand for money goes up because of

Government borrowing, the price goes up. It is the law of supply and demand. Not even the House of Representatives can repeal that law. It forces interest rates up and forces the costs for family budgets up. We would all be better off if it did not happen.

Finally and perhaps most importantly, we have developed a psychology of borrowing. In my opinion, it is an irresponsible and immoral psychology of borrowing that says that we can give out benefits today. We can spend money today and pass the cost along to future generations in the form of a lower standard of living, higher taxes, jeopardized Social Security benefits and a lower level of Government services.

That is not fair. It is disingenuous and it is wrong.

In the days and weeks ahead, let us work together. Let us find the common ground, and let us finally balance the Federal budget.

ON EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to go through this special order tonight on education. I would like to cover some of the myths, some of the truths, some of the other, basically the good, bad, and the ugly of the program.

First of all, I covered a little bit of it the other night when we split up, with the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], talking about Bosnia, but I would like to reexamine some of the figures. First of all, the Federal Government provides only 7 percent of the funding for education. Let me repeat that. The Federal Government provides only 7 percent of the education. The other 93 percent is paid for by State revenues.

Now, of that 7 percent that goes down, less than 25 cents on every dollar that we send back here to Washington, less than 25 cents on a dollar goes back and down to the classroom. Why? Because of the bureaucracy that eats up the dollars in between. So it is a very inefficient system.

When people talk about Head Start and Goals 2000 and some of the better programs, it would be much better to get a better return on the dollar at the State level and provide those systems without the Federal intrusion.

□ 2130

Now, also that 7 percent that the Federal Government sends down to the States, that 7 percent takes over 50 percent of the rules and regulations to the States and the schools. Only 7 percent requires over 50 percent of all the State rules and regulations. It requires 75 percent of all the paperwork that a State has to do.

While that is being accomplished, that also affects the 93 cents on a dollar, or 93 percent, that the States fund education itself. If we look at just the State of California, which I am from, and let me go through and you can go through State by State and find out that there are many similarities, but let us look at the State of California. Why is education being shut down right now and programs are being cut? Why can we not get school bonds passed? Why can we not put a tax increase on the State recipients to support our education systems? Why do we have teacher and school programs that are being canceled under the current system as it exists today?

If we ask ourselves those questions and we look at the problems we are having in every State on our education programs, then I would think Members on both sides of the aisle would say there is a lot of room for improvement.

Let me take a look at some of these factors that affect the State of California. Remember, again, 93 cents on a dollar, 93 percent of all education is paid for with a State tax dollar. So that means you have to have people working in the States that are paying taxes.

Let us take a look at the 1993 tax bill under President Clinton. President Clinton cut defense \$177 billion. The State of California is one of the largest defense States in the Union. A \$177 billion cut as between our military and secondary and defense-related jobs has lost over a million jobs.

Now, let us say that a portion of that million jobs that were lost in the defense industry and our military, they get another job. Well, studies have shown that they do not get the same high scientific-level job but it is something less, so there is even less revenue. But let us take half of that, or even a quarter of that, that those people do not have jobs in the State of California. Now, that means less revenue, 93 percent less revenue that goes into the coffers in Sacramento, CA, for education and for law enforcement and the other infrastructures.

Let us take a look at another factor in the State of California, and primarily on the border States. There are over, Mr. Speaker, there are over 800,000 illegal aliens in kindergarten through the 12th grade. I only use the term 400,000. That way it cannot be disputed. But there are nearly a million illegals in kindergarten through 12th grade in the State of California.

Let us take a look at just the school lunch program. Of that 400,000, the majority of them are under 185 percent below the poverty level. At \$1.90 a meal, that means if you take that times 400,000, that is over \$1.2 million per day just going to illegals in the school lunch program. And then? we talk about that we do not have enough dollars for education. It takes about \$5,000, I think the average is around \$7,000 nationwide, but it takes about \$5,000 a year to educate a child in the

State of California. If we take that and multiply it times 400,000, that is over \$200 billion out of the coffers that we could be using for education, Mr. Speaker, in the State of California.

We have documented 18,000 illegal felons; these are just the ones that are caught, in California prisons alone. There are actually about 24,000 aliens, but only about 18,000, between 16,000 and 18,000 of those are illegal aliens in the State of California prison system at an average of \$25,000 a year to House them. We are spending billions of dollars in a program that could go for education. When they talk about there are more prisons than there are dollars for education. That is the one area that we could really work on is to stop the illegal immigration into the United States and protect our borders.

Over half of the children born in San Diego and Los Angeles hospitals are to illegal aliens. Then that child then becomes an American citizen and qualifies for all of the Federal programs. That, again, is draining the resources out of Sacramento, the dollars that we need for education.

Let me just, Mr. Speaker, let me go through one single, just one single Federal program that was written with good intent, and in many cases has done a lot of good but has gone to the extremes. I would talk about the Endangered Species Act.

You say, "DUKE, how does the Endangered Species Act affect education?" Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker. How many jobs have we lost in the timber industry and the billions of dollars of revenue in the State of California that would go into the Sacramento coffers for education? Billions of dollars.

Look at the gnat catcher and the construction industry in the State of California. It has cost us billions of dollars of revenue that is not going into our coffers for education. I look at the water and the salmon and Central Valley water project that was passed when we were not in the majority. Look how that has affected the farmers in the State of California. California's No. 1 commodity is agriculture. A lot of people do not understand that.

Take a look how it has affected the farmers, avocados and exports and different areas, again revenue. How many jobs, Mr. Speaker, have we lost to the tuna industry because of the porpoise? When we have valuable resources and we have systems in which even in the Panama agreement that have been represented by five of the environmental groups, except for Earth Island, that receives a lot of its money, over a million dollars, just for the Tuna Save, but yet they are one of the organizations that does not support logical reform in the tuna industry.

I look at the kangaroo rat, the least tern vireo, the California desert plan that took millions of acres off of the tax roles that do not go into education, hundreds of thousands of jobs and billions of dollars of revenue that is not going into the coffers in Sacramento,

Mr. Speaker, and then we are having to close down education programs because we do not have the funding.

You will find that library services and media and central and study halls and those areas are being closed down, not just in the State of California but across this land, because of the lack of jobs and because of the lack of money that is going into those coffers from the State level because of Federal systems.

Alan Greenspan, and my colleague just a minute ago spoke eloquently about the need to balance the budget, another reason we do not have dollars for education, Mr. Speaker, Alan Greenspan testified last week before the committee that interest rates have gone down 2 percent primarily because the markets and the lending industries believe that the Republicans can balance the budget in 7 years. He also warned that if that belief goes away, that interest rates will not only rise beyond the 2 percent but will keep spiraling upward.

What does that mean, Mr. Speaker? For example, a college loan, let us talk about an individual family in California or your State or anybody's State, a college loan with 2 percent interest rates over 4 years at \$11,000 means \$4,500 back in either the student's pocket or the parent that loaned the money in the first place, \$4,500.

People are wondering why, why are two people having to work and they cannot make ends meet. I mean, it is crazy. In the State of California, and I am sure across the States, where people are having to work, they are slaving, they are working 10 to 12 hours a day and they are just barely making it on a margin in small business. But if you look at the interest rates, for example, in a home mortgage, why are they paying these excess costs? Why can they not make it? A home mortgage, 2-percent reduction, \$90,000 mortgage, which is not real high in the city of San Diego, it is in the inner cities, but a \$90,000 mortgage, 8.5 percent fixed over 30 years means \$37,500 back in the pocket of that individual, and you can attribute that to the balanced budget, or lack of a balanced budget, because of those interest rates.

Alan Greenspan also said that those interest rates will continue to go down if we balanced the budget by 2 to 4 percent, and think of the dollars that that will put back into the pockets of the American people. They will buy products. The cost of goods will go down. And that will mean there will be more dollars in the coffers of Sacramento for education.

An auto loan, \$15,000, will be a thousand dollars back in the pocket of an individual. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you would like to have another thousand dollars in your pocket to spend at Christmastime, or whatever, and, by the way, then you are going to buy a hamburger, you are going to go to a movie, and that is going to support the other businesses. That revenue is going

to be generated, and it is going to go into, again, 93 percent of the revenue for education, which comes out of the State, and we need to provide that.

But that is another reason why the balanced budget is important to education.

I would like to provide for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, an article where it says the Endangered Species Act, in the State of California, has added \$44,000 per home in the State of California. Let me repeat that: The endangered species has added 7.5 percent to every home, and we are talking about low-income homes for the poor and the impoverished, and we increase it. We just talked about how important 2 percent is. If it is increased 7.5 percent, \$44,000 per home. Why? It is because in endangered species, you have got set aside land, and you build on others' lands. Who is going to pay for that? The consumer is going to pay for that, Mr. Speaker, and in doing that, that means less revenue again for education that goes into the coffers, and so on.

I would like to provide that for the RECORD. It is called "Habitat Protection Raises Building Costs." It is "In the Opinion," North County, San Diego. I will give you that in just a little bit. It is very important why we do not have the dollars in education.

Let me tell you about this institution, Mr. Speaker. For the past 40 years, it has been about power. It has been about the power to be reelected so that you can maintain a majority. That power has emanated from the ability of the Federal Government to disburse money down to many groups. I am sure, like myself, every day we have people coming into the offices for dollars. Everything is important. They can find a reason to support their particular Federal program.

But that is why we have ended up, and in all the debate about why the deficit and the debt are important, it comes down to what is important for us in education. But if you take a look at what we are trying to do is take the power out of Washington, DC, because the power to be reelected equates to the power to disburse money out of the Federal Government, which acquires power at a Federal level, and a bigger bureaucracy to disburse those dollars. Those dollars that go down to disburse are as little as 23 cents on every dollar. There is only 30 cents on a dollar in your welfare programs because of the bureaucracies.

Some of my colleagues will tell you, well, look, you are cutting education, you are cutting education, you are cutting the money for the environment, you are cutting the money for Medicare. We zeroed out, Mr. Speaker, the dollars for Goals 2000 on a Federal level. Absolutely, you could say on a Federal level it is accurate to say we cut Goals 2000, zeroed it out. But as Paul Harvey says, the rest of the story is we take the dollars and we send it directly to the State, take those dollars directly to the State, and the State can run a Goals 2000.

The proponents of Goals 2000 will tell you, well, it is a voluntary system. It is the old bait-and-switch, Mr. Speaker. It is voluntary if you do not want the money in the Goals 2000, and I would challenge you to read it. There are 45 instances that says "States will," "States will," mandates from the Federal Government. It set up five, actually six bureaucracies and institutions, new bureaucracies and institutions that the States have to adhere to. You have to file boards. You have to send the reports to the Federal Government, and guess what, Mr. Speaker, while you have got this manpower at the State that is having to do all of these things which takes dollars away from the classroom, you have got a catcher's mitt of bureaucracies on the other end receiving all of those reports and analyzing. Do the States meet those requirements? Do we allow them to run with the dollars just like it is?

The answer is, again, it is a waste of taxpayer dollars. Let us do away with that:

□ 2145

Remember, 7 percent requires over 50 percent of the rules and regulations. Let us send it to the States. Let us let the States run their own Goals 2000, and prosper better. But yet my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will say "You are cutting Goals 2000, a good program." If it is so good, let them run it, but let them run it at the State level, without the Federal bureaucracy and the Federal intrusion.

As I mentioned, there are 45 must-do clauses, while it only has three that said you should do in Goals 2000. Six new bureaucracies and research institutions under Federal control. It is also established and run by the union bosses and the Federal administration.

In 1979, the Department of Education doubled. It went from \$14.2 billion to \$32.9 billion. If the President's direct loan program were allowed to be affected, it would be the largest lending institution in the United States. That is Federal intrusion, that is Federal control, and it is Federal waste, Mr. Speaker.

Per pupil spending grew 35 percent between 1979 and 1992. Federal programs and taxes have increased threefold. SAT scores have declined 12 percent, and yet we have less than 12 percent of our classrooms that have a single phone jack. We look at the bureaucracy that eats up the dollars, and we look at why we do not have dollars for education.

Let me give you another idea about Goals 2000. The humanities standard at the Federal level, after spending \$900,000, \$900,000, was suspended, Mr. Speaker. One of the required standards was that English be replaced, English be replaced, Mr. Speaker, with the words "privileged dialect." That type of social engineering and politically correct Federal intrusion is one of the reasons I believe that our school systems are doing poorly.

Look at the Federal history standards. They emphasize everything but the foundations of Western culture. I sat with the creators of those standards, with the gentleman from Michigan, DALE KILDEE, the ranking minority member on the education subcommittee that I serve on, and DALE KILDEE, an ex-history teacher before he came to this body, stood up and said, "It is wrong. You are not teaching history, you are emphasizing non-history issues." For example, there is more in the Federal standards for history on Madonna than there is the Magna Carta. There is more on McCarthyism than there is on the Constitution of the United States.

These are some of the reasons why many of the people do not support Goals 2000 on a Federal level, but where at a State level, where the State establishes the standards, they can establish the same aid standards under Goals 2000, but it does not have the rules and regulations, it does not have the Federal intrusion, and it sure costs a lot less to run.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard some of my colleagues say, "Well, we are cutting student loans." Well, Alice Rivlin of the Clinton administration proposed to eliminate college loan subsidies for a savings of \$12.4 billion. Well, that is not done in this body. There is no subsidy taken out.

I heard my colleague just before say, "Well, maybe we will not have to cut Pell grants." Pell grant awards are the highest this year than they have ever been in history.

Mr. Speaker, let me repeat: Pell grants, Pell grants that I believe in, for low income students, is at the highest level it has ever been in its history.

Now, I would also let the Speaker know that it is not enough; that with the rising costs of tuition and with the rising costs of books and college courses, that it does not pay what it was originally intended for with Mr. Pell. But we put \$6.5 billion into that program.

Perkins student loans increase by 50 percent, Mr. Speaker, over 7 years. Let me repeat that. They say we are cutting education in this balanced budget. But, again, I give you the Goals 2000. Zero it out at the Federal level, yes. I want to cut most of these things out of the Federal level and put it back to the States.

The same thing with the environment. There is a lot of sand and dirt between San Diego, CA, and Maine, Mr. Speaker, and to blanket across the Nation with a rule and regulation from the Federal Government that has been obtrusive should not happen. It should be at the State level.

But, again, we are sending the money to the state on the environment. My colleagues will say we are cutting funds for the environment, we are cutting education, we are cutting Federal instruction. Let me repeat, student loans increase by 50 percent, from \$25 billion to \$50 billion over the next 7 years.

The Republicans will spend \$340 billion over 7 years on education, job training and student loans. The last 7 years, the Democrat leadership, when they were in the majority, spent only \$315 billion on education, job training, and student loans.

Spending on K through 12 education has increased by 4.1 percent, but yet we bring better management, less rules and regulations, less Federal paper, less Federal reporting, and more local, school and down at the LEA control with the teachers, the parents, and the educators.

From 1983 through 1993, the States put in education \$60 billion and have increased that to \$115. But yet if you take a look the increase in spending for education across the board, Mr. Speaker, on reading skills, I heard on the television today that a great number, better than 50 percent, of the children do not read up to grade level 4 in the State of Maryland.

California was last in literacy. I think there are different reasons for that. A lot of it is probably the immigration rates and other things. I want to tell you, my wife is a teacher and a principal, and there are a lot of great schools that we have across this Nation. There are some great teachers. But across the board, Mr. Speaker, our education systems are failing our children, and it is not efficient. We can do better. From both sides of the aisle we can do better, by taking the power out of Washington and putting it back at the State level.

Let us look at, for example, title I. I was back in my district this weekend, and one of the teachers said "DUKE, don't take money out of Title I, because it is important."

Well, let me tell you what the Clinton administration said. Title I is not achieving its goals. Comparisons to similar cohorts by grade and poverty levels show that the program's participation does not reduce test scores gapped for disadvantaged students. Indeed, Chapter 1 student scores in all poverty cohorts decline between third and fourth grades. They also go on to say that once a student goes on in education, that any gains made are lost.

Let us look at Head Start. This is again what the Clinton administration says, effective in some areas. I would say in all fairness, Mr. Speaker, I have visited some very good Head Start programs. In the State of California, my district, there is a great Head Start program. Even the administration agrees that there is mismanagement across this country in the field of Head Start. But yet we continue to pump money into it and do not demand that the standards and the values and the management is there for the Head Start program. We have got to change that.

Several studies indicate a short-term cognitive and effective social benefit for poor children. However, the same studies indicate as the child moves into the elementary school the effects de-

cline. They decline to zero. If we are going to put the dollars into education, Mr. Speaker, that are effective, that are long lasting for our children, that teach reading, writing, arithmetic and so on, then I think we need to focus on getting what will get the best bang for the dollars.

Let us look at the student loan program, where we say we have increased student loans by 50 percent. But where did we get our savings from? The Clinton administration, President Clinton's direct student loan program cost \$1 billion more than the private industry, like the banks and lending institutions. My colleagues on the other side will say "Well DUKE, that is just for the rich. You are just supporting the special interest groups and taking it away from the Federal Government."

Well, with the Federal Government and its mismanagement, and I think you can look across the board, that is in defense, that is in education, that is in welfare, NIH, anywhere, the mismanagement of dollars the taxpayers give us, and you can save it by privatizing that, then we will do that. So we limit the President's direct loan program to 10 percent and save billions of dollars. That is not including the savings CBO scored. They do not even know what it would take to receive those dollars back. That is just the administration fees on the direct loan program.

So, yes, there are programs that we have eliminated and cut. But, again, Mr. Speaker, those are on a Federal level in driving the dollars back down to the States.

Let me tell you about other savings that we made on the loan program. This country has a law on the books that has been overlooked. I want to separate illegal aliens form legal aliens. We have legal aliens in this country that are going to our colleges and universities. It is to our benefit to educate those aliens at a time, because they plan on becoming American citizens. Over a lifetime, for just completing a bachelor's degree, there is an increase of earnings in that household by over \$300,000. Again, that means \$300,000 in revenue that that person is going to earn and pay taxes on. Remember, State taxes pay for 93 percent of education, so it is to our benefit.

But, at the same time, almost anyone has been qualifying for those education loans. So what we did, let us say, which I am not, but let us say I was a low-income parent applying for a student loan at a low-income rate, low-interest rate. I would have to show what my earnings are to qualify.

Well, all we have done, Mr. Speaker, is ask the sponsor of that legal alien, because under the current law that sponsor has to sign a document that they will be responsible for the alien, that legal alien, while they reside in the United States and are working for citizenship for this country, their earnings are calculated to see if that student qualifies for a low-income loan,

the same as an American citizen would have to do. We think that is fair, either as a citizen or as a legal alien, to qualify to see if you should qualify for a low-income loan.

Say, for example, Imelda Marcos' relatives came to the great State of California. We may want to give those individuals a low-income loan, because they can pay for it themselves.

But there is an increased cost on lenders, guarantors, and agencies in the secondary markets in the Federal education loan program. We save over \$1 billion, Mr. Speaker, I think that is important also.

□ 2100

Let me speak to something else, and I think we could probably get support from both sides of the aisle on this issue. As I mentioned before, we have less than 12 percent of our classrooms across this Nation that have a single phone jack in it. I think every Member in this body understands the importance of the information age in the 21st century. In the olden days, as my daughters like to report, it used to take 30 years for us to double our knowledge. It now takes 1 year, Mr. Speaker.

Look at the amount of children that are using computers now in many of the homes. Of course, many children are not. Take a look at the information they have available to them. Look at our libraries. Try to get an airline ticket without going down and using a computer. Or even in our classrooms or in our offices. Yet, less than 12 percent of these classrooms have even a single phone jack. If we want to take that 7 percent as a vision and really do something with education on a Federal level, Mr. Speaker, I think there can be a partnership between the Federal Government, between the States, and between private enterprise.

I want to give my colleagues an example. If we really want to help education, if we do not upgrade those classrooms with the technology for our children to learn, then the delta, the difference, between the rich and the poor, as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle like to point to all the time, that delta will increase significantly because we do not provide the skills for our children to go on and apply to the job market.

I have industry and small businessmen across the board come to me and say, DUKE, as little as 25 percent of the people that come to us even qualify for basic entry level into the job market because they cannot read, they cannot write, they cannot do math, or they cannot speak English. We are failing our kids, Mr. Speaker.

Now, let us work at a Federal partnership, let us work with the telecommunications subcommittee with the gentleman from Texas, Mr. JACK FIELDS. Let us create, which they are doing, a market where there is profit sharing, to where the AT&Ts and the Baby Bells, and the IBMs and the Aples work and build up our classrooms.

Let us let them make a dollar. Profit is not a dirty word, unless one is a socialist. Let us let them build up our classrooms, provide for our kids, because we cannot do it. We do not have the dollars on the Federal level to invest in our classroom.

Mr. Speaker, walk down here in Washington, DC and look at these schools. These kids are lucky to have books sometimes. Or look at a Federal housing project, where kids are carrying guns. They are not carrying books. If we do not build these classrooms and work with that private partnership, then I think we will be lost.

I talk to Alcoa and I talk to AT&T and the Baby Bells, and the people I am talking about. We have about a 3 percent disintegration of copper wire in our electronic system. We have about another 3 percent where we build new schools and new facilities. That would be a 6 percent investment in this Nation that we could work with the Federal, the State and private enterprise. Six percent a year. And it would not take us that many years to build up our classrooms.

Now, let the AT&Ts and the Baby Bells and the IBMs put the fiber optics in there, and the Alcoas. Let them make a profit from that, but, at the same time, they are investing in our school system. Let us give incentives to do that because again, if we do not do that, Mr. Speaker, our kids are going to be in the big delta between the rich and the poor because they will not have the skills to go forward.

I want to give my colleagues a classic example. I have a school I have spoken about in the committee. It is Scripts Ranch. The city and private enterprise went in and put fiber optics into the school. Every classroom has a computer. We have boys and girls at the high school level, on the vocational side, that are swinging hammers. They are building modular units, and they sell those units, those classrooms. And if we were to inspect them, they are as good as any tradesman would do, because they are supervised by tradesmen, both union and private, by the way. And they are making sure the kids are safe when they swing their hammers. But they sell those units and they buy other high-technology equipment for that school.

On the other side, the kids that are college bound, not vocational bound, are the engineers, the computer designers and the architects. They are using the computers and they have redesigned the whole school. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, in the summer, and were chastised for the summer jobs program. Probably not very many jobs were created by the summer jobs program, other than keeping kids busy, but let me tell my colleagues about the summer jobs program at Scripts where they have the computers and they have the kids working in vocational and college bound.

The city of San Diego hires these kids. The unions and private enter-

prise, under apprenticeship programs, they teach them a skill on the vocational side and they give them a better on-the-job training for their college preparation. And it works, Mr. Speaker. It is a good program. And it is an investment between the Federal, the State, and private enterprise.

This is similar to the model that I can see for this whole country, Mr. Speaker, in investing in our school systems. We can do that, if we can get away from the Federal socialized meddling with States' rights and let the States set their own educational standards, and let the States, if they want, have their own Goals 2000, and let the States do their own Head Start Program and keep the Federal rules and regulations, the inadequacies and the bureaucracy.

But, again, this place is about power. This whole balanced budget, and we will hear over and over and over again, from those that would put a socialist model on education, that this is the only place that can make those decisions. This government, at a Federal level, is the only one, because the States will not do it. We do not trust the States to do it because they want the power here in River City.

And that is what this whole debate is on the balanced budget. Because if the budget is balanced, Mr. Speaker, that power to disburse money and control dollars with rules and regulations down to the State level limits the minority party for reelection. And if we limit reelections, we limit the power. We limit the power to get reelected. It is a self-contained sewer system. That is what the budget debate is. They do not want to balance the budget because it limits their ability to flow dollars down to constituents.

I have told my colleagues about the plaque the President has on his wall during the election that said "It is the economy, stupid." It is not. It should be their pocketbook, stupid. Because when we touch somebody's pocketbook, liberal or conservative, they are up here fighting for those dollars, because the Federal Government is not going to provide it for them. And we should learn that lesson, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would agree with this next statement; that part of the problem that we have with education is the current welfare system. I look, and I used to teach at Hinsdale High School in Hinsdale, IL. We have some of the finest schools in the, Chicago, IL, area, and, I think, in the world. We have Hinsdale and Evanston and Nutriert. But any time we look at the good schools, the good teachers, where they have good facilities, we need to look beyond that at the inner cities and some of the areas where the education programs, like Washington, DC, or any great city that we could come across.

There is an area of about 5 miles in Chicago of Federal housing. Those kids do not carry books, Mr. Speaker, they

carry guns. It is loaded with pimps and prostitutes. Their pregnancy rates are terrible for unwed mothers. And what hope do those kids have? Do we think if we put computers in those schools that they would learn? Do we think across the country there is a low percentage of our teachers that even know how to turn on or even use those computers to teach those skills?

That is why I think the intereducation program, the Eisenhower grants, even through we get very little of the money back down, I would rather have the State provide it. But if we do not teach and give our teachers the funds, the wherewithal to upgrade their schools, like title 1 and Eisenhower grants, then how can we ask the teachers to perform and teach the kids, especially when they do not have computers in there in the first place. They have to learn those skills to be able to teach our kids.

If we look at the welfare system that we have, and I think it is one of the biggest reasons why education has failed, Mr. Speaker, where we have a system that discourages a parent coming together with a mother, a single mother, and a child or vice versa. If they do, we take that welfare check away from them. We discourage that couple getting together.

And I think my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would agree that every time I have been to a college event for graduation, or someone going to an academy or an education event, where there is success, the overwhelming majority of those successes involve where parents were involved with their kids. And if we do not have the parent involvement, the percentage, of those kids are going down. Yet the welfare system deters people from coming together or even a mother working.

Take a single mother. She wants to go to work. She will have to pay for child care. She is probably going to have to buy a new set of clothes. She will have to probably get some kind of training, because she has not worked in a second or third generation in many cases. But in many cases it is not, it is someone that has lost their job, that is having a hard time and they need to go back and they need the support. But there is a discouragement to get off of the system, because, again, we say go to work. You will have to have all these other costs, but we will take your welfare check away from you.

Well, I think we need to provide that. I also do not think we have provided enough funds for the job training, which my colleagues harp on. Why? Because if we are going to solve the problems of the welfare problem and reform, and if we are asking these people to get off of welfare, then they are saying for what? If I do not have the skills, if I have never worked in my life, or I have limited skills and I cannot read and cannot write, which the statistics show across the country, and I cannot even qualify for an entry-level job, how am I going to go to work and

support my family? That is the area where I think, if anything, we need to increase the amount of job training for people, to help them get off of welfare.

I think, also, that when we look at the folks on welfare and look across the board, the low-income child is more likely not to succeed than those that come from higher socioeconomic levels. My colleagues on the other side are exactly correct on that. But the question is, Mr. Speaker, the model. Do we have a socialistic model, where the Federal Government does all and costs us extra dollars to get the dollars down because of the bureaucracy and the power and the rules and the regulations; or do we let the States, where we take away all those other costs?

My colleagues will say we at the Federal Government are the only ones that can do that. Mr. Speaker, I think that is intolerable. I think if we want to clean up our education system, we need to give States more responsibility and more power to do what they need to do. Because like I said, there is a lot of sand between San Diego, California, and Maine.

There are a lot of great programs out there, Mr. Speaker, and the States can still run those programs. But when we are getting as little dollars down that we can, down to the State level, I think that there is a lot of room for error and a lot of room that we can improve.

I want to give my conservative colleagues a caution, however, which I am a conservative. But serving on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, I have been enlightened in some cases by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and I see one of them grinning right now. If we try to do this too fast, and we can look at the State of California and the economic situation that I have just talked about. Try and pass a school bond in San Diego County. It is very difficult. Even on a State-wide election or an initiative. Most people check no if we want to increase their taxes or increase their burden. It is very difficult to support that. Try an increase in tax, a gas tax or anything, to pick up that load to the State. People are resistant, Mr. Speaker.

A lot of my conservative friends, and which I consider myself one of, want to chop it off now; want to do totally away with it. If we do that, in my opinion, in my humble opinion, Mr. Speaker, we will damage some of the very programs that we are helping. I say that in the face of only getting 23 cents out of a buck.

But until we have that transition, until we can balance the budget, and it all ties in together, welfare, balanced budget, and education and jobs and revenue. It all ties in. It is called microeconomics. But until we can reduce those interest rates, until we can improve the economy, until we can get more dollars into people's pockets by having a \$500 tax rate per child, that goes back into the pockets of people, until they can see where they are not

both having to kill themselves just to get by to pay their mortgage, which they are paying \$40,000 more for, or they are paying \$4,500 more interest on a loan because of the deficit, then I think we will have trouble shifting that power.

□ 2215

And I think over the next 7 years, we ought to look and do very, very carefully. Are we going to make some mistakes, Mr. Speaker? Yes, we are. But I think the blessings of it are that are going to return that power to the States. We are going to reduce the size of the Federal bureaucracy back here, which is so key to the Democrat Party and their maintenance of power. And that is why they will blast us night after night saying that we are hurting the environment, we are hurting kids, we are hurting seniors and so on. What we are hurting is their power to get re-elected so that they can have the power in River City.

ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST AFRICAN-AMERICAN TO SERVE IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure this evening to engage with my colleague from South Carolina and others who may come, a special order dealing with an anniversary tonight of the seating of the United States House of Representatives on December 12 in 1870, 125 years ago, Congressman Rainey, Joseph H. Rainey, was sworn in to the United States House of Representatives. Today being December 12, we celebrate 125 years of that important event.

Let me say that on that day, Representative Rainey broke the color line in the House of Representatives, being the first African-American to be seated. He became a duly elected Member of the 41st Congress. A former State senator from South Carolina, he was born of slave parents. His parents were very successful as a barber and his dad purchased his freedom for him at an early age.

As a young man Joseph Rainey spent all of his free time educating himself. He followed his father as a barber and he continued to increase his education. At an early age he moved to Philadelphia where he met a young lady named Susan, and they were married and he moved back to South Carolina in 1859. Then with the outbreak of the Civil War, Mr. Rainey, Joseph Rainey, was drafted. He had to at that time work in the military.

He worked in an area providing food and serving passengers on a Confederate blockade runner and he worked in the fortification of Charleston, but

he did not feel comfortable being a part of the Confederacy as a freeman and what he was able to do with his wife was to escape on a blockade runner and went to Bermuda. In Bermuda he settled in St. Georges, which is a parish in Bermuda and he set up a barber business there and his wife went into dress-making. Both of them were very, very successful in their business in Bermuda, but as a South Carolinian, Bermuda was fine, business was great, but he yearned to go back to his home State and his hometown.

He started to hear about the fact that after the Civil War there had become opportunities for African-Americans in politics and he became very attracted to the area of politics. He decided to look into some of the opportunities and he became an active member of the South Carolina State Republican Party. He became a member of the State senate there, and in July 1870, they nominated him to fill a vacancy in the House of Representatives created by the resignation of Representative Benjamin Whittemore.

Once in Congress, and there was some time that passed before he was seated, but once in Congress, Representative Rainey was a staunch fighter for the rights of African-Americans. His first speech on the floor of the House was to gain national attention and to support a bill that imposed stiffer penalties against individuals and groups terrorizing African-Americans and white Republicans in former slave States. The speech was delivered on April 1, 1871, in the 42d Congress. The bill that he introduced was designed to enforce the citizenship rights set forth in the 14th Amendment of the Constitution and in the 1866 Civil Rights Act.

The bill, called the KKK Act, made it a Federal crime for two or more persons to conspire through force, intimidation, or threat to keep any person from accepting or discharging a public office, from functioning in court without hindrance, or from voting or otherwise participating in political campaigns under the penalty of a \$500 to \$5,000 fine and 6 months to 6 years in jail.

The KKK Act was enacted into law on April 20 in 1871, but the law did not immediately stop the bloodbath in the Southern States. Representative Rainey continued his work on the KKK Act by speaking in favor of the appropriations of Federal funds for the Federal courts that were set up under this act to enforce the law.

Representative Rainey was in favor of appropriating funds as necessary to carry on the court's persecution, until every man in the Southern States shall know that the government has a strong arm and that everyone shall be made to obey the law.

In the 43d Congress Representative Rainey concentrated on the civil rights measure to afford equal treatment to all in public accommodations, public transportation, hotels, amusement places, and schools. Representative